

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

_____)	
ENARGY POWER (SHENZHEN))	
CO. LTD., <u>et al.</u> ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 13-11348-DJC
)	
XIAOLONG WANG, <u>et al.</u> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO EXTEND THE LIMITATION
ON THE NUMBER OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS
[Docket No. 56]

September 17, 2014

Boal, M.J.

Plaintiffs have moved for an order allowing them to serve additional requests for admissions. Docket No. 56. Defendants oppose the motion. Docket No. 64.

Plaintiffs are limited to twenty-five requests for admissions by the Local Rules of this Court. See LR 26.1(C). Nevertheless, requests for admissions serve an important purpose: to narrow the issues in a case, and relieve the parties of the burden of proving trial facts which are undisputed. Fed. R. Civ. P. 36, 1970 Advisory Note; 8B Wright and Miller Federal Practice and Procedure, Civil § 2253 at 326. Requests for admission can be particularly helpful in authenticating documents. For that reason, this Court is inclined to allow the Plaintiffs to serve requests for admissions seeking authentication of documents in excess of Local Rule 26.1's limit.

Here, many of the proposed requests for admission deal with the authentication of documents and signatures. Accordingly, the Court holds that the Plaintiffs may serve the following requests for admission: Requests Nos. 26-27, 35, 53-55, 58-60, 63-65, 68-70, 73-75, 78-80, 83-85, 88-90, 93-95, 98-100, 103-105, 108-110, 113-115, 118-120, and 123-125 to Xiaolong Wang and Request Nos. 26-30, 33-37, 40-44, 47-51, 54-58, 61-65, 68-72, 75-79, 82-86, 89-93, 96-100, 103-107, 110-114, 117-121, and 124-127 to Cecei Chen. The Court has reviewed the remaining requests for admission and finds that they would impose a burdensome and time-consuming task and/or would be unlikely to significantly narrow the range of disputed factual issues.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Jennifer C. Boal
JENNIFER C. BOAL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE